

R E M A R K S

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion that follows. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,522,743 to Hurd. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hurd in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,335,268 to Kelly, Jr. et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,522,743 to Hurd. In response, independent claims 1, 11 and 21 have been further limited to a message table that contains indicia that determines whether a message is forwarded or not forwarded. Support for the further limitations may be found at numerous locations throughout the specification (e.g.: page 4, lines 1-9; page 5, line 29- 32; etc.).

In contrast and as admitted by the Examiner, Hurd merely describes a database and router 30. As would be abundantly clear to those of skill in the art, a router functions to route messages and only to route messages. Nowhere within Hurd is there any teaching or suggestion of a message table that contains indicia of a type of message that determines whether a message is forwarded or not forwarded. Since Hurd fails to provide any teaching of the claimed message table, any rejection based upon Hurd would now be improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Claim 4 has been rejected as being obvious over Hurd in view of Kelly, Jr. et al. However, Kelly, Jr. et al. also fails

to provide any teaching of the claimed message table. Since Kelly, Jr. et al. fails to provide any teaching of the claimed message table, the combination fails to teach each and every claim element. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim element, any rejection based upon Hurd and Kelly, Jr. et al. would now be improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Allowance of claims 1-25, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 

Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

January 7, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500